

SECTION 3 — SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Proposed False Claims Act Disclosure

Scope of the Investigation

This report documents observations collected between December 2024 and June 21, 2026. The activity described remains ongoing at the time of publication.

Primary observations were conducted from Boone, North Carolina. Supplemental observations were made during travel along Interstate 40 through Tennessee, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. These multi-state observations allowed comparison of aerial activity across diverse geographic locations.

The purpose of this investigation was not to determine the identity, origin, or nature of any observed objects. Instead, it focused on documenting observable phenomena, associated aerial activity, environmental conditions, publicly available records, and governmental activity while preserving a factual record for independent review.

Investigative Principles

This investigation was guided by the following principles:

- Document observations before developing explanations.
- Preserve original evidence whenever possible.
- Distinguish observations from interpretations.
- Compare observations with publicly available records when appropriate.
- Exclude evidence that does not fairly represent what was visually observed.
- Preserve chronological order to permit independent reconstruction of events.
- Present evidence in a manner that allows readers to independently evaluate both the observations and any conclusions drawn.

Observation Methods

Observations were conducted nearly daily. The primary vantage point was a consistent location in Boone, North Carolina, overlooking the surrounding airspace. On many days, aerial activity was monitored for up to thirteen hours. Photographs and videos were captured as representative samples to demonstrate frequency, persistence, and operational characteristics. Handwritten logs recorded the broader volume and nature of operations.

Because the activity was highly persistent, it was neither practical nor necessary to document every single occurrence. This report therefore presents representative documentation sufficient to establish the ongoing nature of the observations while maintaining a manageable evidentiary record.

Documentation and Evidence Preservation

All photographs and videos were captured using consumer-grade equipment: a Kodak PixPro camera and a cellular telephone. Original files, including metadata, have been preserved on an air-gapped computer dedicated solely to evidence storage. All materials are organized chronologically, indexed, and cross-referenced throughout the report.

Publicly Available Supporting Information

Direct observations were routinely compared against publicly available data, including Air Quality Index (AQI) readings, PM2.5 measurements, weather conditions, satellite cloud imagery, public aviation data, NOTAMs (including the March 2026 Blowing Rock NOTAM), and other relevant records.

Beginning on or about January 2, 2026, publicly available flight-tracking information for many aircraft in the observation area became increasingly limited. Aircraft that were visually observed were, in many instances, no longer displayed on publicly accessible flight-tracking services despite remaining visibly observable from the ground. This report documents those discrepancies without drawing conclusions regarding their cause.

Evidence Selection Criteria

Only photographs and videos that accurately represented what was personally observed were included. AI-generated imagery, filtered or enhanced images, Night Mode photographs, and any material that materially distorted the observed objects were intentionally excluded.

Whenever possible, photographs include familiar reference objects—including trees, the Moon, or stars—to provide scale and context under the same atmospheric conditions. In many instances, naturally occurring celestial objects appeared partially obscured by atmospheric particulate while the observed aerial objects remained comparatively distinct.

Methodological Note — Reduction of Suggestibility

To minimize confirmation bias, I deliberately avoided researching UAP literature, documentaries, or online discussions before documenting my own observations. Each event was first observed, photographed, and logged independently. Only afterward did I determine whether similar phenomena had been reported in public sources. Unless I first personally documented a phenomenon, I deliberately refrained from researching similar reports.

Analytical Method

This report maintains clear distinctions between direct observations, documentary evidence, environmental measurements, public records, legal analysis, and interpretive discussion. Factual observations are presented separately from interpretations whenever possible, allowing readers to evaluate the evidence independently.

Purpose of the Investigation

The investigation had two primary goals:

1. To preserve a factual record of persistent unidentified aerial phenomena, associated aerial activity, and environmental conditions.
2. To document observable governmental activity, publicly documented responses, and potential public safety concerns.

Particular attention was given to repeated low-altitude operations over populated areas, unusual maneuvers, coordinated activity, and contemporaneous environmental conditions.

The report also raises questions regarding public transparency and the potential impact of sustained aerial operations on communities.

Limitations

This report was prepared by a private citizen using only publicly accessible information and consumer-grade equipment. No classified information, government resources, or specialized instrumentation were used.

The author has professional experience as a paralegal, academic training in American constitutional history, and prior work as a False Claims Act relator. However, the author has no formal scientific training, military background, aerospace expertise, or prior interest in UAP-related subjects. This lack of prior involvement shaped the decision to avoid external UAP narratives during the investigation.

This report should be evaluated on the strength of its documented evidence, chronology, and cited public records rather than on any claim of specialized expertise.